THE ANNALS

AND

MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY.

[THIRD SERIES.]

No. 9. SEPTEMBER 1858.

XVI.—On Praniza and Anceus, and their Affinity to each other. By C. Spence Bate, F.L.S. &c.

[With two Plates.]

THE small Crustacea known by the names of Anceus and Praniza have long been objects of interest to naturalists. The peculiarity of their form and our ignorance of their habits have not only induced carcinologists to consider them as forming distinct genera, but even to group them in separate families.

Colonel Montagu described the first specimens in the seventh and eleventh volumes of the Linnæan Transactions, among other marine animals taken on the coast of South Devon. Dr. Leach believed that they might ultimately be found to be but different sexes of the same species, and this has been the opinion of many other naturalists.

There has been a mystery attendant upon their habits also. Praniza has frequently been taken associated with parasitic Crustacea: not so Anceus. Hence Colonel Montagu, Mr. Westwood, and M. Otto have considered *Praniza* to be a parasite upon certain animals. It has been taken, by Colonel Montagu, attached to the Father Lasher (Cottus Scorpius). On the other hand, it has been found quite as frequently, along with Anceus and other nonparasitic Crustacea, in the crevices of rocks and in shore-pools, as well as in deeper water. In the first of these positions it has been taken on the clayey shores of Strangford Loch by Mr. Haliday, who, I believe, is among those who hold most strongly the opinion that it is a separate species of animal from Anceus, his conclusion being based upon the structure of the oral organs. Here hypotheses have rested, until facts of greater or less importance should assist us in arriving at a correct conclusion.

On the 26th of November, 1856, a paper by M. Hesse of Brest was read by M. Coste before the Academy of Paris, in Ann. & Mag. N. Hist. Ser. 3. Vol. ii.

which it is stated that *Praniza* and *Anceus* are but two ages of one and the same animal; that, after having lived during a certain time under the form of *Praniza*, it assumes that of *Anceus*, and in this latter stage gives birth to young *Praniza*. The reverse of this appears to have been the idea of Mr. A. White, when he prophesied, in his recent 'Manual of the British Crustacea,' "that there is some likelihood that *Anceus* may prove to be one of the stages of *Praniza*."

M. Hesse's statements rest upon no hypothesis. They are the result of facts that he himself has witnessed, drawings of which accompany his memoir. The whole are now being submitted to a commission composed of MM. Duméril, Milne-Edwards,

and Coste*.

In studying the smaller forms of Crustacea, I have obtained many specimens of each of the animals in question; and though I have hitherto confined myself to the study of the *Amphipoda*, I am induced not to allow the data I possess upon the question to remain any longer concealed.

Before entering upon a discussion of the subject, it will be desirable to have a clear idea and just appreciation of the forms of the separate parts as well as of the general structure of both animals. I shall therefore commence by an examination of the

adult Praniza.

The cephalon is quadrate. The eyes, sessile and prominent, are situated upon each side of the head. The antennæ are four, nearly equal. Posterior to the cephalon are two distinct segments, each supporting a pair of legs directed anteriorly. Then follow three membranous segments fused into one large oval division. This, together with the two preceding segments, and one, too insignificant to be observed by unassisted vision, form the pereion. It consists of six segments only. So also the pleon, which is much narrower than the pereion, and laterally carries two pairs of foliaceous appendages upon each of the six segments.

The general outline of the head appears to converge to a point anteriorly. This has universally been the accepted form of the animal,—a form that is due, not to the shape of the cephalon, which is, as I before observed, square, but to the shape

and position of the labium and organs of the mouth.

The labium (Pl. VI. fig. 7 d'') in Praniza is an important organ. It is large, and projects horizontally forwards. The anterior margin is concave, and considerably narrower than the posterior. From the centre of the anterior edge, after having traversed the inferior surface of the organ, projects a small siphon.

^{*} Since this paper has been in the press, the report confirming M. Hesse's views has been presented to the Academy by M. Milne-Edwards. See Annals, 3rd series, No. 8. p. 164.

The mandibles (d) originate from the inferior base of the labium and project horizontally forwards, lying immediately beneath and parallel with that organ; the tips of the former extend beyond the extremity of the siphon. The anterior half of the inner margin of each mandible is strongly denticulated.

The maxillæ (e, f) originate posteriorly to the mandibles, are lanceolate in form, slightly curved, and serrated upon the inner

margin.

The maxillipedes (g) consist of four or five articulations, from the anterior inner margin of each of which a long lanceolate

process is produced.

There is but a single pair of gnathopoda (h); these consist of six articulations,—the coxæ probably being fused, as is the case with all the other limbs, into the body of the animal. The dactylos of the gnathopoda is developed into a powerfully formed hook, both the limbs being directed horizontally forwards. This pair originates apparently from the ventral surface of the posterior part of the cephalon; but close observation, particularly in a lateral aspect, discloses a small segment behind, and distinct from the cephalon (Pl.VI. fig. 8 H). It is from this segment that the pair of gnathopoda originates.

The two next pairs of legs are homologous with the two anterior pairs of pereiopoda in Amphipoda. Each is laterally attached to a distinct segment, and directed forwards. It is chiefly upon this fact that Professor Dana has constituted his group Aniso-

poda. In this respect Anceus agrees with Praniza.

The three posterior pairs of legs are the three posterior pereiopoda, and are attached to one inflated membranous segment, the
result of a fusion of the three posterior segments of the pereion.

The pleon is much narrower than the pereion. It consists of six distinct segments, each of which is furnished on each side with a pair of ciliated foliaceous appendages attached to a uniarticulate peduncle. The posterior segment terminates in a

point.

This description is taken from *Praniza cæruleata*. It is to be regretted that the name should have been adopted from the colour of the animal. I have received them of a bright grassgreen from Mr. Loughrin of Polperro; blue, from the crevices in the slate in Plymouth Sound; and dredged them of an ash-grey, as well as transparent and a dirty-white, in five or six fathoms of water in the same locality. There can be no doubt, moreover, as stated by M.-Edwards, that *P. fuscata* of Johnston, which is described to be of a reddish-brown colour, is the same animal.

That we have more than one species is certain. Besides cæruleata, two specimens of a different species have been sent to me by Mr. Edwards of Banff. This species, to the eye, differs in

12*

the more continuous and less graceful outline from the anterior part of the head to the posterior part of the pereion, the shortness of the pleon, and the smallness and more equal size of the pereiopoda; and in the less easy to be detected, but not less important facts, that the mandibles do not extend beyond the labium, and the gnathopoda have but four articulations and terminate in a rudimentary form. The powerful hook is wanting. One of this latter species, which I shall name Edwardsii, after its finder, who has been a valued correspondent during my researches in this class of animals, was charged with young. It is a remarkable fact, that in the young the organs generally bear a closer resemblance to those of P. cæruleata than to those of their own parent species.

In the young the mandibles project beyond the labium. The gnathopoda are furnished at the extremity with powerful hooks. The siphon is prominent and well formed. The five conspicuous segments of the pereion correspond in their relation to each other, the centre one being the largest, and the posterior and anterior being equal and the smallest: no fusion exists between any of them. On the ventral surface of the four posterior segments is pendent a membranous sac. It is the monstrous enlargement of this sac in the development of the animal, fusing into one segment and separating widely apart the three posterior pereiopoda, that gives to this animal its most remarkable and peculiar

feature.

In an examination of *Anceus* we find some points that assimilate and others that are widely distinct from the structure of *Praniza*. The eyes are sessile and placed anteriorly upon each side of the head. The *cephalon* is quadrate, depressed from the centre to the anterior margin; the lateral edges are raised like walls on each side.

The antennæ (Pl. VII. fig. 3 b, c) are subequal, placed, as in Praniza, at the anterior lateral angles of the cephalon, and one

immediately above the other.

The labium is absent or rudimentary.

The mandibles (d) are prominent and powerful; they originate at the anterior extremity of the cephalon, and extend horizontally in advance of the head.

The maxillipedes (g) consist of five articulations, a projecting

process arising from the basal one.

The gnathopoda (h) consist of two articulations, one large and the other very small. The large one is straight on the exterior and convex on the interior margin; the latter is ciliated and laps over the corresponding margin of the opposite gnathopod. The whole forms a squamiform and efficient operculum to the organs of the mouth.

The succeeding segments are as broad as the cephalon. The three posterior segments of the pereion are slightly nar-

rower, and imperfectly fused together.

The pereiopoda bear a close general resemblance to those of

Praniza, though somewhat more tuberculated.

The pleon is much narrower than the pereion, and consists of six segments, each of which is furnished on each side with a pair of ciliated foliaceous appendages attached to a uni-articulate peduncle. The posterior segment terminates in a point.

Upon comparison, therefore, of Praniza with Anceus, we find differences as important as those which usually exist between genera or even families. Hence their classification by naturalists into separate genera, as Anceus and Praniza, each of which has been taken as the type of a particular group or family.

Other observers, knowing the frequent distinction that exists between the forms of the different sexes of the same species, have assumed that the distinction between Anceus and Praniza is one of sex only. To this idea I had a considerable inclination.

Examination of the details of both animals shows us no distinction that is not reconcilable with this idea. The mandibles resemble each other in form and position, and differ only in size and strength. The labium is absent in Anceus, and developed into a siphon in Praniza,—a distinction, I am informed by Professor Kinahan, that was first pointed out by Mr. Haliday. But that this may be only a sexual distinction, we may infer from the fact that the males of parasitic Isopods differ in a similar respect from their sedentary females.

I have hitherto been inclined to believe that all Pranize were females; -that the great membranous enlargement which is separated into four divisions upon the ventral surface was a pouch for the development of the ova, and the homologue of the pouch that is carried upon the ventral surface of the pereion in

all the Edriophthalmous Crustacea.

There is certainly nothing in the young of Praniza from which we could assume that an Anceus might not be developed. This appears still more correct when the larva has grown a little, as may be seen in fig. 3. Pl. VI., where the form is

intermediate between Praniza and Anceus.

Recently M. Hesse has astonished us by the statement that Anceus is the adult animal, and that Praniza is the young; that he has, if I understand correctly from the short notice in the 'Comptes Rendus*,' witnessed not only the change of the former into the latter, but, moreover, the reproduction of the latter from Anceus.

^{*} March 22, 1858, p. 568.

The experience of M. Hesse is quite at variance with my own observations. The larva which I have figured in Pl. VI. fig. 2 is one of about twenty that I obtained from the *Praniza* I have given in fig. 1. It appears therefore that some fallacy must have crept into the researches of M. Hesse, since *Praniza* is evidently an adult animal. The mysterious law governing reproduction under the phase of alternation of generations can scarcely account for the discrepancy, since the young of *Praniza* bear to the parent as close a resemblance as is found usually to exist between the old and young. They differ only in the relative proportion of certain parts; and others, which are not required until the age of puberty, are necessarily in abeyance.

M. Hesse says that Anceus bears young. This fact being discovered by him, proves that there are female Ancei. This, together with the fact that I have stated relative to Praniza, demonstrates the error of M. Hesse's hypothesis, "that Praniza is the early stage of Anceus," and goes far to establish the foregone conclusions of previous naturalists, that the two animals

belong to distinct genera.

M. Hesse says not only that Anceus bears young, but that these young are Pranizæ. We know, from experience in observation, that the larvæ of any given tribe of Crustacea are generically similar: as I have previously shown, there is a considerable resemblance between the young of Praniza and the adult Anceus; so therefore we may infer that the general resemblance of the larva of Anceus to the larva of Praniza is considerable,—a circumstance that may account for M. Hesse's assumption that the former are Pranizæ.

I think we may, from what is known, deduce the following

conclusions :-

That (upon M. Hesse's observation) Anceus is an adult animal. That (upon our own observation) Praniza is an adult animal. That Praniza consequently cannot be developed into Anceus. That Anceus is a distinct genus from Praniza.

That the males of both genera have yet to be discovered.

The males of both Anceus and Praniza have to be made out; but it is not rash to infer that they may so nearly resemble the

females, as to make it a test of considerable difficulty.

I have recorded that in *Praniza Edwardsii* the gnathopoda have an immature character, while in *P. cæruleata* they possess the appearance of an efficient organ. It is not improbable that this may be a sexual distinction in every species of *Praniza*: to this inference I am led by the fact that all the larvæ of *Praniza Edwardsii* possess the powerful hook seen in *P. cæruleata*, while it is absent in the parent. I have elsewhere expressed a conviction that the larvæ of Crustacea possess at an early

stage the rudiments of both sexes,—a circumstance which, if correct, would account for the gnathopoda being different in the larva from the same organs in the adult female. I hope to be enabled to set this point at rest before it is embodied in the work I have in hand.

With regard to Anceus, I have as yet no experience to lead

me to any conclusion.

There is a mystery in the production of the ova of *Praniza* that would well repay the embryologist for studying. I have before observed that they are occasionally taken transparent, white, ash-grey, green, blue, and red-brown. These varieties of colour appear to be dependent upon the progress made in the advancement towards spawning, or in some way connected with the development of the ova.

When the animal is blue, I have observed a double line of ova traversing the length of the enlarged segment, as seen in fig. 4, Pl. VI., and figs. 7, 7", Pl. VII. This I presume to be the ovary or the oviduct previous to the escape of the ova into the incubatory pouch, which they ultimately fill, to the apparent annihila-

tion of the other contents of this part of the animal.

I have watched specimens in a glass, and perceived, after a few days, that the blue mass, which at first appeared to fill and distend the large segment of the percion, gradually diminished, apparently deteriorating. It recedes first from the margin. In so doing, it displayed a series of layers, placed one before the other, lying across the animal. There were indications also of these layers being divided by cross-sections. It is from one so depauperized that fig. 4 in each plate is taken. The ova ultimately fill the pouch, first as seen at fig. 6. Pl. VII., and ultimately as shown in fig. 8, where the embryo has considerably advanced towards completion.

The blue appearance is now changed to a brown,—a circumstance that is due to the reddish pigment-cells which mark the

pereion of the young animal.

The nervous system is similar to that of other Isopoda. The ganglia of the three posterior fused segments are distinct, and an intermediate branch is given off on each side from the nervous cord, between each ganglion. One cord only appears to be given off on each side of every ganglion except the one preceding the last three of the pereion; this appears to give off three upon each side. Those within the cephalon I could not distinctly make out; but, without being fused, two ganglia appeared to be brought close together. Possibly the ganglion belonging to the suppressed gnathopoda may be present.

The animal is small, but the nervous system is readily detect-

able along the ventral surface of the undissected creature.

EXPLANATION OF PLATES.

PLATE VI.

Fig. 1. Praniza Edwardsii: 1 q, maxilliped; 1 h, gnathopod.

Fig. 2. Larva of ditto.

Fig. 3. Ditto, older, of cæruleata?

Fig. 4. Praniza caruleata: 4 b, upper antenna; 4 c, lower ditto; 4 f, maxilla; 4 g, maxilliped; 4 h, gnathopod.

Fig. 5. Cephalon and appendages (dorsal surface): b, superior antenna; c, inferior ditto; d", labium; h, gnathopod; 5 a, part of the eye

Fig. 6. Labium enlarged (from below): d", siphon; d, mandible; b, an-

tenna (inferior).

Fig. 7. Cephalon and appendages (ventral aspect): a, eye; d, mandible (turned back); d", labium and siphon; e, f, maxillæ; g, maxilliped; h, gnathopod. Fig. 7 d". Ditto, lateral view.

Fig. 8. Lateral view of head and anterior part of pereion.

Fig. 9. Ditto of pleon and posterior part of pereion.

Fig. 10. Nervous system.

PLATE VII.

[The four lines at the top of Plate VII. represent the natural sizes of the larva at the time of being hatched, and a little later, of Anceus maxillaris and Praniza caruleata respectively.]

Fig. 1. Anceus maxillaris. Fig. 2. Cephalon, lateral view.

Fig. 3. Ditto, seen from below: b, upper antenna; c, lower ditto; d, d, mandibles; h, gnathopod; 3 g, maxilliped; 3 h, gnathopod; h", cilia enlarged.

Fig. 4. Ventral aspect of body of Praniza. Fig. 5. Ditto of Anceus.

Fig. 6. Ova of Praniza (early stage).

Fig. 7. Pereion of Praniza with ova: 7", ova of same. Fig. 8. Pereion of Praniza with ova; 8", ova of same.

Plymouth, July 20, 1858.

XVII.—Remarks on Lepas anatifera, Linn. By George Lawson, Ph.D.

On the 9th July, 1858, while the steam-ship 'Dundalk' was passing through Banff Bay, on her passage from Inverness to Granton, the attention of the crew and passengers was attracted by a remarkable object floating in the water, which was at first supposed to be a huge fish. A closer examination proved it to be a squared log of fir timber, somewhere about thirty feet in length, completely covered throughout its entire lower surface with a dense crop of barnacles.

The log was brought to Granton Pier, whence I obtained a supply of specimens for examination. The species is Lepas